

Appl. No. 10/787,296

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendment

Claim 1 has been amended so as to recite "transmitting a first page on a first network to an area defined by first location information pertaining to the first network and independently generated [emphasis added] second location information pertaining to a second network". Applicant submits that this amendment is fully supported by the application as a whole and that no new subject matter has been introduced.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Before setting forth a discussion of the prior art applied in the Office Action, it is respectfully submitted that controlling case law has frequently addressed rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102. "For a prior art reference to anticipate in terms of 35 U.S.C. Section 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference." Diversitech Corp. v. Century Steps, Inc., 850 F.2d 675, 677, 7 U.S.P.Q.2d 1315, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 1988; emphasis added). The disclosed elements must be arranged as in the claim under review. See Lindemann Machinefabrik v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 730 F.2d 1452, 1458, 221 U.S.P.Q. 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984). If any claim, element, or step is absent from the reference that is being relied upon, there is no anticipation. Kloster Speedsteel AB v. Crucible, Inc., 793 F.2d 1565, 230 U.S.P.Q. 81 (Fed. Cir. 1986; emphasis added). The following analysis of the present rejections is respectfully offered with guidance from the foregoing controlling case law decisions.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-7, 9, 14, and 15 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by United States publication No. US 2004/0102199 ("Haumont"). In response, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection for reasons detailed below.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner contends that Haumont teaches "transmitting a first page on a first network to an area defined by first location information pertaining to the first network and second location information pertaining to a second network [emphasis added]". Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Examiner refers to paragraph 46 of Haumont, which recites that "the 3G SGSN 104 initiates a page through the 2G SGSN 102, by sending a page

Appl. No. 10/787,296

command 204 to the 2G SGSN on the interface 122". Paragraphs 50 and 51 of Haumont teach that an identification of the paging area is transmitted to the 2G SGSN 102 from the 3G SGSN 104 by means of the paging request 204. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the page transmitted on the 2G SGSN 102 is in response to the page command 204 and that the page is transmitted to an area defined by location information provided by the 3G SGSN 104. Therefore, Haumont teaches that the page is transmitted on the 2G network to an area defined by single location information, and not "first location information" and "independently generated second location information" as recited by claim 1 as amended.

As stated above, "for a prior art reference to anticipate in terms of 35 U.S.C. Section 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference". Since Haumont does not teach "independently generated second location information", Applicant submits that Haumont does not teach "every element of the claimed invention" and therefore does not anticipate claim 1.

Regarding claims 2-7, 9, 14, and 15, Applicant submits that Haumont does not disclose the subject matter of these claims for similar reasons provided above in respect of claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-7, 9, 14 and 15.

The Examiner rejects claims 19-22 under 35 USC 102(c) as being anticipated by United States patent US 6,560,457 ("Silver"). In response, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection for reasons detailed below.

The Examiner contends that Silver teaches "processing the second location information with the first location information pertaining to the first network to generate intersection information [emphasis added]". Applicant respectfully disagrees. Silver teaches in column 7, lines 50-54 that "MSC 112 preferably maintains a database, lookup table, or other means through which information representing the location of an MT in the data network 120 can be mapped or cross-referenced [emphasis added] to a corresponding location within the voice network 110". Accordingly, the information representing the location of the MT within the voice network 110 is merely a mapping of the information representing the location of the MT in the data network

Appl. No. 10/787,296

120. Silver further teaches that "such information is used by the MSC 112 to determine in which regions of A, B and C is approximately located". However, Silver is silent to generating intersection information. Moreover, Applicant submits that there would be no purpose for one to generate intersection information in Silver. Since the location information of the MT in the voice network is a mapping of the location information of the MT in the data network, any intersection information generated would correspond to the location information of the MT in the data network, which would in turn correspond to the location information of the MT in the voice network. Since such intersection information provides no new information, there is no purpose for computing such intersection information.

By contrast, the "first location information" and the "second location information" of the present application are independent from one another in the sense that they are not mere mappings of one another. Accordingly, generating intersection information produces useful information.

As stated above, "if any claim, element, or step is absent from the reference that is being relied upon, there is no anticipation". Since Silver does not teach generating intersection information, Applicant submits that claim 19 is not anticipated by Silver.

Regarding claims 20-22, Applicant submits that the subject matter of these claims is not disclosed by Silver for at least the reasons provided above in respect of independent claim 19.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 19-22.

Claim Rejection – 35 USC 103

The Examiner relies on Haumont as disclosure for claim 1 and looks to other prior art as disclosure for the limitations recited by claims 8, 10, 12, 13 and 16 to reject these claims under 35 USC 103(a). However, as argued above, Haumont does not teach claim 1 of the present application. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the Examiner's position is not well founded.

Appl. No. 10/787,296

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 8, 10, 12, 13 and 16 in view of Applicant's arguments provided above in respect of independent claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, early favorable consideration of this application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

MUNJE, ARUN

By



Allan Brett

Reg. No. 40,476

Tel.: (613) 232-2486

Date: March 1, 2006

RAH:PDB:kbc